Remarks

Claims 1-24 are pending, but stand rejected. In view of the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's thoughtful reconsideration. The Applicant also asks that the Examiner take the time to address all of the limitations of Claims 10 and 15. With respect to Claim 10, the Examiner fails to address the limitation of receiving input that specifies at least one print job criterion and an e-mail address. With respect to Claim 15, the Examiner fails to address the limitation of accessing the document to determine if the document has at least one characteristic.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §102

Claims 1-8, 10-11, 13-17, and 19-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,613,160 issued to Kraslavsky

Claim 1 is directed to a method of transmitting a message and recites the following elements:

a) determining if a device encounters an event while processing a job;

b) determining if the job meets a pre-determined criterion; and

c) transmitting a message to a remote destination when each of a set of pre-determined conditions exist, the pre-determined conditions include:

    a. determination that the device encountered the event while processing the job; and

    b. a determination that the job met the pre-determined criterion.

The Examiner mistakenly asserts that Kraslavsky, col. 16, lines 11-14 and col. 17, lines 31-36 teaches transmitting a message to a remote destination when each of a set of pre-determined conditions exist, the pre-determined conditions include: (a) a determination that the device encountered the event while processing the job and (b) a determination that the job met the pre-determined criterion.

7

To help illustrate the Examiner's misunderstanding, the cited passages from Kraslavsky are reproduced below.

> If the POST is not successfully accomplished at Step S3, a failure indication is logged at Step S4 and this information may be transmitted to the network over the LAN interface. An LED failure/diagnostics light on the NEB or printer may also be activated.

Kraslavsky, col. 16, lines 11-14.

> At more advanced levels, the number of pages per job plus a log of failure conditions may be logged; or the job start and end times may be logged in addition to the failure conditions and the number of pages per job. The logging level is set by CPINIT.

Kraslavsky, col. 17, lines 31-36.

A cursory review of these passages reveals that Kraslavsky discusses sending a failure condition log to a network and that failure log can include a number of pages per job as well as a start and end time of a job.

The Examiner equates determining if the job meets a pre-determined criterion with Kraslavsky's discussion of a including the number of pages per job in a log. Assuming to be true, Kraslavsky still does not teach or suggest sending the log to the network when the print job meets the pre-determined criterion of including some pre-determined number of pages. Instead, Kraslavsky teaches sending the log to the network regardless of the number of pages of a print job. In other words, the number of pages required for a print job is not a pre-determined criterion that in some manner serves as a condition as to whether or not any information is sent to Kraslavsky's network.

Consequently, Kraslavsky fails to teach or suggest a method that includes transmitting a message to a remote destination when each of a set of pre-determined conditions exist, the pre-determined conditions include (a) a determination that the device encountered the event while processing the job; and (b) a determination that the job met the pre-determined criterion.

8

S/N: 10/059,083
Case: 10008202-1
Response to Office Action

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over Kraslavsky as are Claims 2-9 due at least in part to their dependence from Claim 1.

Claim 10 is directed to a method of transmitting a message and recites the following elements:

a) receiving input that specifies at least one print job criterion and an e-mail address;

b) submitting a print job to a printer for processing;

c) determining if a device encounters an event while processing a job;

d) determining if the job meets the pre-determined criterion; and

e) if it is determined that the print job meets the at least one print job criterion and that the printer encountered an event while processing the print job, then transmitting an e-mail message to the e-mail address.

It is initially noted that the Examiner does not address the recitation of receiving input that specifies at least one print job criterion and an e-mail address. For this reasons alone, the rejection of Claim 10 is defective and cannot stand.

As clarified above with respect to Claim 1, Kraslavsky simply does not teach or suggest (1) determining if a device encounters an event while processing a job, (2) determining if the job meets the pre-determined criterion, and then (3) sending of an e-mail message to the e-mail address if it is determined that the print job meets the at least one print job criterion and that the printer encountered an event while processing the print job.

For at least these reasons, Claim 10 is patentable over Kraslavsky as are Claims 11-14 due at least in part to their dependence from Claim 10.

Claim 15 is directed to a computer readable medium embodying a program of instructions for causing a computer to perform the followings:

9

(a)   receiving a request from a user to print a document:

(b)   in response to the request, performing the following substeps:

    (i)   accessing the document to determine if the document has at least one characteristic:

    (ii)   submitting a print job that describes the document to a printer;

    (iii)   determining if the printer encounters an event while processing the print job; and

    (iv)   if it is determined that the print document has the at least one characteristic and that the printer has encountered the event while processing the job, then commanding a device to transmit a message to a pre-determined address.

It is initially noted that the Examiner does not address the recitation of accessing the document to determine if the document has at least one characteristic. For this reasons alone, the rejection of Claim 15 is defective and cannot stand.

Nonetheless, as clarified above with respect to Claims 1 and 10, Kraslavsky simply does not teach or suggest (1) accessing a document to determine if the document has at least one characteristic, (2) determining if the printer encounters an event while processing the print job, and then (3if it is determined that the print document has the at least one characteristic and that the printer has encountered the event while processing the job, then commanding a device to transmit a message to a pre-determined address.

For at least these reasons, Claim 15 is patentable over Kravslavsky as are Claims 16-18 due at least in part to their dependence from Claim 15.

Claim 19 is directed to a computing system that includes the following elements:

a)   means for receiving input from a user that specifies at least one print job criterion;

10

b) means for receiving a request from the user to submit a print job to a printer;

c) means for responding to the request by submitting the print job to the printer;

d) means for determining if the print job meets the criterion;

e) means for determining is the printer encounters an event; and

f) means for transmitting a message to an address upon a determination that the print job meets the criterion and that the printer has encountered the event.

As clarified above with respect to Claim 1, Kraslavsky simply does not teach or suggest (1) means for determining if the print job meets the criterion, (2) means for determining is the printer encounters an event, and (3) means for transmitting a message to an address upon a determination that the print job meets the criterion and that the printer has encountered the event.

For at least these reasons, Claim 19 is patentable over Kraslavsky as are Claims 20-24 due at least in part to their dependence from Claim 15.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §103

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,613,160 issued to Kraslavsky in view of USPN 5,778,183 issued to Fillon. Claim 9 depends from Claim 1 and includes all the limitations of that base claim. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so is Claim 9.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §103

Claims 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,613,160 issued to Kraslavsky in view of USPN 5,778,183 issued to Fillon in further view of USPN 5,751,961 issued to Smyk. Claim 12 depends from Claim 10 and includes all the limitations of that base claim. Claim 18 depends from Claim 15 and includes all the limitations of that base claim. For at least the same reasons Claims 10 and 15 is patentable, so are Claim 12 and 18.

11

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-24 define allowable subject matter. The Examiner is requested to indicate the allowability of all claims in the application and to pass the application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,
Shell S. Simpson

By _____

Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

July 19, 2006

12